



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/525,919	03/31/2006	Yoshihiko Nagata	5703-008/NP	4133

27572 7590 03/26/2007  
HARNESSE, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. BOX 828  
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER
----------

GANESAN, SUNDHARA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3764

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/26/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

ED

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/525,919

Applicant(s)

NAGATA ET AL.

Examiner

Sundhara M. Ganesan

Art Unit

3764

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s)    is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s)    is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s)    is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s)    are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 February 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.   .
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                             |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                                       | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. <u>  </u> |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                              | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                           |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/25/2005</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>  </u>                                                |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement filed 02/25/2005 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

### ***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 2 of the specification, the word "summery" appearing on line 26 should presumably be --Summary--.

On page 9 of the specification, the word "associate" appearing on line 6 should presumably be --associated--.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to because they include black and white photographs. 37 CFR 1.84. (b)(1) states:

*Black and white.* Photographs, including photocopies of photographs, are not ordinarily permitted in utility and design patent applications. The Office will accept photographs in utility and design patent applications, however, if photographs are the only practicable medium for illustrating the claimed invention. For example, photographs or

Art Unit: 3764

photomicrographs of: electrophoresis gels, blots (e.g., immunological, western, Southern, and northern), auto- radiographs, cell cultures (stained and unstained), histological tissue cross sections (stained and unstained), animals, plants, in vivo imaging, thin layer chromatography plates, crystalline structures, and, in a design patent application, ornamental effects, are acceptable. If the subject matter of the application admits of illustration by a drawing, the examiner may require a drawing in place of the photograph. The photographs must be of sufficient quality so that all details in the photographs are reproducible in the printed patent.

In this case, photographs are not deemed to be the only practicable medium for illustrating the claimed invention. Furthermore, the photographs are not of sufficient quality so that all details are reproducible in the printed patent.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 10-11, 13-14 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Allum (US Pat. 6,063,046). Allum describes the same invention as claimed, including: a plate (26), a motor (58), a sensor (80, col. 11 line 59- col. 12 line 11) for measuring rotation angle, a torque measuring mechanism (82, col. 12 lines 61-65), a kinetic model analyzer (24, col. 10, lines 6-10), and a motor controller (24, col. 10, lines 2-4) for controlling the motor in accordance with a predetermined kinetic model, as in claim 10 of the instant application.

Regarding claim 11, Allum describes the plate as rotating around an axis of rotation extending in parallel with the top surface of the plate (axis 54, see Figs. 4-5).

Regarding claim 13, Allum shows the top surface of the plate as being spaced apart by a certain distance from the center of the axis of rotation (see Figs. 4-5).

Regarding claims 14 and 19, Allum describes the torque measuring mechanism as having a pair of force plates (col. 12, lines 38-40) each comprising an integrated sensor unit. Allum describes a pair of fore and aft force transducer pairs that are utilized to calculate the resultant forces acting at the subject's center of gravity (col. 12, lines 42-50), which measures force and a position of a center of loading, as required by claims 14 and 19.

Regarding claim 18, Allum describes the balance training device as providing the training independently and exclusively directed to each one of three organs, including a semicircular canal, vision, and deep sensibility (see Fig. 1, subject feedback is provided in visual, auditory, tactile, and electro-vestibular manners).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allum (US Pat. 6,063,046) in view of an obvious design choice.

Allum does not disclose expressly the top surface of the plate as coinciding with a plane containing a center of the axis of rotation.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to space the top surface of the place such that it coincides with a plane containing a center of the axis of rotation, because applicant has not disclosed that doing so provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected Allum's balancing device, and applicant's invention, to perform equally well with either the spacing taught by Allum or the claimed coincident top surface and axis of rotation, because both spacing dimensions would perform the same function of perturbing a balance platform.

Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to modify Allum to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12, because such a modification would have been

Art Unit: 3764

considered a mere design consideration which fails to patentably distinguish over the prior art of Allum.

Claim 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allum (US Pat. 6,063,046) in view of Orman et al. (US Pat. 4,785,674). Allum describes the invention substantially as claimed, as described in the 35 USC 102(b) rejections above. Allum does show a potentiometer (80) mounted on the shaft of the motor, but does not describe using it for torque sensing.

Allum does not expressly disclose a torque sensor mounted on a shaft of the motor.

Orman et al. teach a torque sensor for mounting on a shaft of an exercise machine, which employs a sensor such as a strain gauge, which deforms and produces an electrical signal that is proportional to the force.

Allum and Orman et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the device of Orman et al. to sense torque on the shaft of the motor of Allum's device. This would be obvious because Allum employs a deformation sensor (potentiometer 80) on the shaft of the motor already, and envisions the use of alternate conventional torque measurement systems (col. 12, lines 58-61).

The suggestion or motivation would have been to employ an alternate method of torque sensing, perhaps as a redundant element to ensure that ankle torque estimations by the force transducers on the footplates are indeed accurate.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Allum with Orman et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claims 15 and 20

Claims 16-17 and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allum (US Pat. 6,063,046) in view of Girone et al (US Pat. 6,162,189). Allum describes the invention substantially as claimed, as described in the 35 USC 102(b) rejections above. Allum does show a system processor (24) as being controlled to transform response measure signals to perturb the platform (col. 10, lines 1-10). Allum further shows an angle sensor (80) which is used to provide information to the system processor (24), which in turn controls the motor and the perturbations of the platform.

Allum does not specifically disclose the use of a kinetic model analyzer characterized in that a motion of the plate is defined by a spring constant, a viscous braking coefficient, and a moment of inertia, or an angle of equilibrium that is arithmetically determined.

Girone et al. describe a balance system which utilizes a kinetic model to control perturbation of a balance platform. In Fig. 9c, Girone et al show a kinematics step (125) in a control diagram. Modeling a system such as that described by Girone et al. by means of a spring constant, a viscous braking coefficient, a moment of inertia, or an angle of equilibrium is taught by any basic mechanical modeling text. For example, Stengel (Modeling Dynamic Systems. Robotics and Intelligent Systems, Lecture 7. Princeton University (2005).) shows a summary of common mechanical modeling techniques.

Allum and Girone et al are analogous art because they are form the same field of endeavor.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ a kinematic model analyzer as taught by Girone et al. in the device of Allum.

The suggestion or motivation would have been to provide an accurate control pattern for the motor to perturb the balance platform for rehabilitative purposes.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Girone et al. and Allum to obtain the invention as specified in claims 16-17 and 21-25.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See form PTO-892 for cited art of interest.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sundhara M. Ganesan whose telephone number is 571-272-3340. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cary O'Connor can be reached on (571) 272-4715. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3764

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

S.G.  
03/16/2007

  
Cary E. O'Connor  
Primary Examiner